

A BILL FURTHER TO AMEND THE INDIAN REGISTRATION ACT, 1908 309
IN ITS APPLICATION TO THE PRESIDENCY OF MADRAS
FOR A CERTAIN PURPOSE (BILL NO. 18 OF 1935)

31st October 1935]

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was taken into consideration.

Clauses 1 and 2 were put and carried.

The Preamble was put and carried.

The Hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—"Mr. President, I move that the Bill be passed into law."

The Hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"I second it."

Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI:—"Mr. President, Sir, I have to congratulate the Hon. Minister for choosing a Bill on which there is not even one Member to speak. It is a unique honour for the Hon. the Second Minister. With these few words I resume my seat. (Laughter.)"

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed into law.

VI.—MOTION *RE* SECOND REPORT OF THE MADRAS
DELIMITATION COMMITTEE.

* The Hon. Mr. G. T. H. BRACKEN:—"Mr. President, I rise to move the motion that stands in my name—

'that the Second Report of the Madras Delimitation Committee be taken into consideration.'

"I do not propose to detain the House with a long speech, but I shall just make a few remarks by way of introduction. The House has now before it the original memorandum of the Government, the first Report of the Delimitation Committee, the provisional conclusions of the Government and the Second Report of the Delimitation Committee. Hon. Members will see that the final proposals or the Second Report of the Delimitation Committee and the provisional conclusions of the Government are not very far apart except on questions of detail. Whatever view we may take of the recommendations of the Delimitation Committee, I think every one will agree that the Delimitation Committee has spent an immense amount of time and taken an immense amount of trouble in connexion with this Report, and I think that the thanks of the Government and of the House are due to Mr. Muthayya Mudaliyar and to the Members of the Committee and of the sub-committees who have given so much of their time to this very important work. ('Hear, hear.')

"I would just like to say one word on the constitution of the Delimitation Committee which has come in for a certain amount of criticism in certain quarters. The Delimitation Committee is, in a manner of speaking, a continuation of the Franchise Committee and therefore the Government thought it proper to continue as many members as possible of the Franchise Committee. At the same time, as

[Mr. G. T. H. Bracken] [31st October 1935]

it was a question of delimitation, it was necessary to have members representing all areas in the province as far as possible. So a few extra names were added or substituted, and among those members were three members who attended the Round Table Conferences at one time or another, as Government thought they had some special knowledge of the subject from the discussions before the Joint Committee.

"This matter of delimitation, I venture to think, is not purely a party matter in the sense that no party can tell how any scheme will work. One party may think that one scheme may suit their interests and another party may think that another scheme may suit their interests. . Speaking quite impartially, I am not sure that any scheme will suit any party. So I hope that the House will consider the various proposals on their merits. Both the advantages and disadvantages of the different schemes have been set out in the original memorandum put forward by the Government. I think it is generally agreed that this memorandum makes a pretty fair presentation of the pros and cons of the different schemes. (A Voice: 'Very well presented.') Any scheme that may be put forward will have both advantages and disadvantages and it is a question of taking what has the most advantages and what has the fewest disadvantages.

"Take for example the question of the single member constituencies and single non-transferable vote as against the plural or multi-member constituencies and the cumulative vote or the distributive vote. Sir, I agree that there is something to be said for any of these schemes, but the Government, after carefully weighing the pros and cons, have come to the conclusion that on the whole the single-member constituency system with single non-transferable vote is the best. In regard to other points I have to mention that the Government have still an open mind on questions of detail and would like to have the views of the House before coming to final conclusions.

4 p.m. "One point with regard to the report of the Delimitation Committee is that neither the views of that Committee, nor those of the Government, nor those of this House are final. It is the Hammond Committee that will decide this matter. It is for this reason that I regret that, while all other parties and interests have been represented on the Delimitation Committee, the Congress party on the back bench opposite thought fit to boycott the Committee though they were offered one seat on the General Committee and one seat on an important sub-committee. I think the reasons they have advanced for boycotting the Committee did not carry much weight. After all what was wanted on the Committee was that different interests and different views should be represented so that those views might be put before the Hammond Committee either on the lines of a report or in the form of minutes of dissent or in the form of a separate memorandum. I think it is a great pity that the Congress party neglected the opportunity of putting forward their views in the form of a minute of dissent if they disagreed with the main conclusions.

31st October 1935] [Mr. G. T. H. Bracken]

“The next point that I would like to put before the House is the question of population as against voting strength. As regards the voting strength, the Government have certain provisional lists prepared in order to give some idea of what the voting strength would be, but since the preparation of these lists, it has been brought to the notice of the Government that the lists are very rough and ready and even more inaccurate than we anticipated, because we subsequently found that in many cases, especially in zamindari areas the registers on which the lists should be based were not up to date and even in some cases were non-existing. So the provisional lists cannot be considered in any way accurate or in some districts as giving a fair idea of the voting strength. I would therefore suggest to this Hon. House that it would be safer in considering the various points to proceed rather on the population basis because we do definitely know the population from the last census tables.

“There is another point regarding the Provincial Council. The Delimitation Committee felt themselves unable to make any recommendation because they had no provisional lists of voting strength. I think this was a reasonable position taken up by the Committee, because to form rather large constituencies for the Provincial Council, it was really unnecessary for them to know the voting strength. Government have now taken steps to have provisional lists prepared, but I regret they are not yet ready to be placed before the House. So, I would suggest that it is hardly worth while considering questions of seats for the Provincial Council except in a very general way.

“I would suggest finally for the consideration of this Hon. House that in the limited time at our disposal it would be better to consider the main principles rather than go into details of different constituencies or different districts. I know that every district would like to have more seats, but if you give a seat to one district, it means taking away another seat from another district. In fact it would mean ‘Robbing Peter to pay Paul.’ I would suggest that propositions of that kind would not be of much use. For instance take Cuddapah district. If one hon. Member were to say that this district ought to have an extra seat, unless that hon. Member suggests what other district is over-represented, it would be of no use. Still less is it of any use, I would suggest to this House, to press that individual communities should be allotted one or more seats. The distribution of seats between different communities has been settled under the Act of Parliament, and I do not think there is the slightest chance of altering the distribution of seats based on the Communal Award at this stage. Therefore, it would be, I think, a pure waste of time, if any hon. Member should suggest that any community should get more seats or that any community which has no seats at present should be specially allotted a seat.

“These are some of the points which seem to me that I can usefully put before the House before they begin the consideration of this very important subject.”

[31st October 1935]

The Hon. Mr. C. A. SOUTER:—"I second it."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I think we will follow the usual procedure of putting this motion to the vote of the House before taking up the amendments."

"The question is that the Second Report of the Madras Delimitation Committee be taken into consideration."

The motion was put and carried.

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Before we proceed to discuss the amendments I should just like to inform hon. Members that we shall discuss this particular item of business the whole of to-morrow. Already as many as 14 amendments have been given notice of, each amendment containing several points and, as the Hon. House knows, several interests, communities, parties, groups, East Coast and West Coast—in fact everybody has to be allowed to speak on this particular item of business, I would request hon. Members to be brief as far as they can and thus enable other Members also to take part in the discussion. As the time allotted is only one day, we should be able to give opportunities to as many Members as possible in this House."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"Before you call upon the speakers to speak on this subject I wish to move that the discussion of this subject may be taken up to-morrow after question time (Voices 'why?' 'why'?)

"Sir, several of us did not expect that this motion would be reached at this stage and some of us, so far as I know, are not really prepared or ready to go on with the amendments, and as such we will not be able to contribute much to the discussion. So it will be convenient if the matter is taken up to-morrow and discussed, as by so doing, it will allow some time for us to prepare and be ready."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"As the hon. Member knows, to-morrow being Friday, one hour of the House will be cut off and if one hour to-day also is cut off, the time at the disposal of the House will be very much reduced. Personally I have no objection to postpone the discussion for to-morrow if that is the sense of the House. I may assure the hon. Member that the whole thing will be a general discussion."

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—"Sir, am I to move my amendment: Is it the idea?"

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"He can move his amendment."

* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—"What I meant was this. When I gave notice of my amendment, I thought I would have an opportunity of discussing the whole report, and then try to move and speak upon my amendment."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I may tell the hon. Member that he is not precluded from making his own observations on the whole report. At the same time he can also move his amendment."

31st October 1935]

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—"Sir, I beg to move the amendment that stands in my name which is as follows:—

Add at the end the following:—

"and on such consideration this Council is of opinion that adequate representation should be accorded to the Ceded districts".

"Before I come to the general consideration of this subject, viz., the report of the Delimitation Committee, I would rather like first to put before this House why I feel that representation given to the Ceded districts is not adequate. I know there is a feeling here that the representation now given to the Ceded districts is adequate. I am quite glad and thankful that the Delimitation Committee considered that the representation given to the Ceded districts according to their original proposals was not quite adequate and in their subsequent proposals have been kind enough to allow two more seats to the Ceded districts. But I would point to the Council and the Government that if they kindly wanted to show some special consideration to the Ceded districts, on account of special circumstances, they will find that the representation now given to the Ceded districts is not more than what was really due to them, even on mere population basis, apart from special circumstances.

"I am afraid both the Government and the Delimitation Committee have overlooked one important fact. In assigning seats to the various districts certain vital considerations ought to have been taken into account. One of those considerations is the fact that certain territorial areas have some special problems, the solution of which requires adequate representation of their interests in the Council."

4-15
p.m.

(At this stage the Hon. the Deputy President took the Chair.)

* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—"One such group of districts is the Ceded districts of Cuddapah, Kurnool, Bellary and Anantapur. They are very backward. On the ground of their backwardness, on a previous occasion the Hon. the late Raja of Panagal deprived the people of Cuddapah of the right and privilege of electing their own district board president. If the backwardness of these districts could be assigned as a reason for depriving the people of the power and privilege of electing their own district board president, I now submit that it would not be unfair if I now claim that for that very reason the Government should show very special consideration in the matter of the allotment of seats in the Council. From the point of view of backwardness in education, lack of communications, poverty and sparseness of population, the Ceded districts ought to be shown special consideration. The Committee themselves, in their second report at the end of paragraph 5, admit that there are special considerations why the Ceded districts should be given more seats than their population would warrant. I maintain that the Government and the Committee have made a great mistake in taking

[Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

[31st October 1935]

population as almost the only basis. But by that I do not mean that the Government should take the number of voters as the basis, especially when they themselves have admitted that the lists of voters have not been prepared properly. I also know that the lists have not been prepared properly. But as between the population basis and the voters basis I would prefer the population basis as the voters' lists have not been prepared properly. Again, Sir, so long as adult franchise is not introduced, I do not see why population alone ought to be taken into account in assigning seats. If adult franchise is introduced, then population may be the chief consideration; otherwise it should not be. Even after the introduction of adult franchise there are considerations like the backwardness of certain areas, the sparseness of population and so on which would make it wrong to adopt the population as the only basis. I do not know how the Committee and the Government have come to the decision of relying mainly on the population basis. His Majesty's Government in their letter to the Central Delimitation Committee have not laid any emphasis on population, nor even referred to it. They have said:

'As regards the delimitation of territorial constituencies, His Majesty's Government, while they are content to leave to your Committee a wide discretion in matters of detail, are anxious that you should make it your general aim to ensure, as far as the conditions permit, the maximum degree of contact between the candidates and the electors and the convenience of both, due regard being had to administrative needs, the ideal to be aimed at being constituencies manageable in area, in number of voters and in physical characteristics.'

"Nothing is mentioned here about population. But except for slight departures in one or two districts, population has been the only basis considered both by the Government and the Delimitation Committee. The letter of His Majesty's Government does not say a word about population while there are many other things on which they have rightly laid emphasis. If His Majesty's Government and Parliament have thought it necessary to increase the number of members both in the Provincial and Central Legislative bodies, it is because they thought that if the numbers were retained as they were, the constituencies would be so large that there would be very little contact between the member and the voters in each constituency. But although the number of members has been considerably increased, we in the Ceded districts have not got any benefit out of it. Cuddapah is at present represented by two members and even after the large increase in the total number of members, our position is not in any way better so far as facilities for contact between members and voters are concerned. Only one revenue division is separated, but the other revenue divisions form one constituency, which is as large as a district. Therefore I do not think there has been any improvement in the position of Cuddapah and the other Ceded districts so far as that aspect is concerned. In assigning seats elsewhere in the Presidency, and in assigning seats to the scheduled castes, both the Government and the Delimitation Committee proceed on the basis that it is better to have small constituencies so that the members may have better contact with the voters. I ask

31st October 1935]

[Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

why not the same consideration be shown in the case of the Ceded districts. Should we not claim at least one member for each revenue division? Most of the revenue divisions in Ceded districts are clubbed together for the sake of forming constituencies. I therefore hope that the Government would see that so far as the general seats are concerned (excluding the scheduled castes' seats) one revenue division should be represented at least by one member, and avoid the necessity to club two revenue divisions for the purpose of assigning a seat to the scheduled castes. Kurnool has only two general seats; Cuddapah also has only two general seats excluding the seat assigned to women. In Kurnool two revenue divisions are clubbed together for forming each of the constituencies. It seems to me to be unjust and unfair to do so.

"If we are going to take into account the opinion expressed by His Majesty's Government in their letter to the Central Delimitation Committee, I am certain that the Ceded districts should be represented by at least five more members. When elections are fought on the party system in the future, it does not matter whether one district is represented by ten members and another district is represented by two or three members, for the general consensus of opinion in each district will be the same towards the parties. Therefore no harm will be done to the other districts on account of a few more seats being given to the Ceded districts. The area is so large that if it is the desire of the Government that there should be actual contact between the candidate and the voter, the constituencies should be reduced to manageable proportions by allotting a few more seats. Unhappily, Sir, it is the impression both of the Government and of the Delimitation Committee that we are adequately represented. On the face of it, it looks as though we are getting a little more representation than is our due on a strict population basis. But the Government and the Delimitation Committee have forgotten one thing. If the Presidency is divided into various territorial groups on account of special considerations, such as the Ceded districts, the East Coast, the West Coast and the Central districts, we as a group ought to be assigned our proper share in the number of seats allotted to the whole Presidency. Now the whole Presidency is represented by 215 members. What is our proper share according to population basis? The four districts have according to the Government memorandum a population of 3,994,543 and as such they will be entitled to $3,994,543 \times 215$ divided by 44,118,348 (population of the Presidency), i.e., 19.5 or roughly 20 seats. And that is exactly the number that has been allotted to us after so much consideration and after, what the Delimitation Committee have thought they have shown consideration to the special circumstances in the Ceded districts. What we have got is what was exactly due to us on population basis and no special consideration has been shown on account of special circumstances.

"What has been done in assigning the seats to districts is to take into account only the general seats, viz., 190. I ask, Sir, what about the seats assigned to Anglo-Indians, Europeans, Backward Areas, Commerce and Industry, Mining, Landholders, University and Labour?

[Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

[31st October 1935]

The Ceded districts have no chance at any time of getting any one of these seats. The figures in the memorandum clearly show that we have no such chance at all. To illustrate what I mean: There are no doubt a few Anglo-Indian voters in the Ceded districts, but their number is insignificant when compared to the total Anglo-Indian population in the Presidency, viz., 152 out of 8,533. Under the circumstances, what the Government and the Delimitation Committee ought to have done is this. They ought to have taken all the 215 seats into account and divided them on a territorial basis allotting the quota to each district or group of districts. After such distribution, if any district or group of districts has a decent chance of getting one or more of these special seats assigned to Commerce, Industry, Labour, Landholders, etc., the number of general seats assigned to such territory or district should be reduced accordingly. Now that the Ceded districts have no chance of getting any of those special seats, I do not see any reason why we should be deprived of our proper share of seats according to the territorial basis I pointed to above. Even to-day we have so many special problems peculiar to our district, such as famine relief, backwardness in education, irrigation projects and so on and if we have to bring to the notice of the future Assembly the nature of those problems and press them to a satisfactory solution, we ought to have our proper share of representation in the Assembly according to, not mere population basis but special territorial considerations.

4-30
p.m.

“ As I pointed out, if you take only the population into account, the Ceded districts should get 19 and odd seats or 20 seats. There is not the slightest chance of any landholders' constituency being represented by a voter from the Ceded districts. There are only 2 or 3 voters in the Ceded districts out of about 200 voters for the landholders' constituency. The Ceded districts will have no chance of getting the labour seats, because there are no voters at all. With regard to the University seat, the number of graduates in the Ceded districts is very few compared with those in the rest of the Presidency. The number of members of the Senate or Syndicate also is very small. Therefore there is not the slightest chance of the University seat being filled by a person from the Ceded districts. So with Commerce, etc. Therefore what I suggest is: you take the Ceded districts as a territorial unit; take the population into consideration and assign the seats to the Ceded districts out of the 215 seats: So with other districts. If, for instance, East Godavari has a fair chance of getting a zamindari seat and if it has got on the above basis 7 or 8 seats, you had better cut off one of the general seats. We have not been shown any special consideration at all either by the Delimitation Committee or by the Government. The Government have forgotten this point perhaps; or their attention has not been drawn to it. They have taken only 190 seats as general seats and made the distribution. If you take all the 215 seats into consideration, the Ceded districts would get even on mere population basis the seats now allotted to them. The Delimitation Committee are of the opinion that special consideration should be shown to the Ceded districts. I plead

31st October 1935]

[Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

that the Ceded districts ought to be adequately represented. According to the present proposals, Cuddapah gets 4 general seats including the women's seat; so also Anantapur; so also Bellary. It is Kurnool that gets only 3 general seats. If you take the population into account, if you take other considerations into account, except for small differences all these four districts stand more or less on the same footing. If you cannot do anything more, if you cannot give more seats to the Ceded districts as a whole, at least Kurnool must get one seat more. You have given one seat to Markapur and Nandyal divisions. Again two divisions (Kurnool and Dhone) have been clubbed together and they get one general seat and one scheduled caste seat. If you give one more seat to the Kurnool district, each division will get one seat each. I plead again that each revenue division ought to be represented by one member. That is not the case now in the Ceded districts. . . ."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"Wherefrom you will take that seat?"

* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—"I can make a number of suggestions if necessary. I have to make some more general observations. With regard to the women's seat, I am glad to find that instead of assigning it to the Cuddapah division as originally proposed, it was assigned to the Rajampet division. It is much better on account of various considerations. It was pointed out by a memorandum submitted to the Government that, as between Rajampet and Cuddapah divisions—the number of women voters in the former division was more. Again from the point of view of the general population and of voters both male and female, Rajampet scores as against Cuddapah. Besides, there is one vital consideration which I think should be taken into account and it is this: Jammalamadugu and Cuddapah are clubbed together for assigning the scheduled caste seat. If the women's seat also is assigned to Cuddapah division, the voter in Cuddapah division has the advantage of voting for 3 members; whereas the voter in Rajampet division has the advantage of voting for only one member. There will be much confusion if a large number of candidates contest the elections. We do not know whether the Central Delimitation Committee would approve of the proposal of the Madras Government that the scheduled caste candidates who come in through the primary election will have the chance of withdrawing. If that is not done, there will be at least 4 scheduled caste candidates for every constituency. If you have 2 or 3 women candidates also, there will be much confusion. I think this is the only instance in the whole Presidency, where a scheduled caste seat was assigned to a constituency which has to return a lady member also. I think it was an oversight and I am glad the Committee had corrected the mistake. If you take the territorial units into consideration, I once more repeat that what was assigned to the Ceded districts is not more than their due even on the population basis. I think the Government are eager to show some special consideration to the Ceded districts. I hope the Government will see its way to recommend 5 more seats to the

[Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

[31st October 1935]

Ceded districts—one seat to each of the four districts and one seat more to the Kurnool district. If that cannot be done for any reason, it is necessary that Kurnool at least should get one seat more, so as to equalize the share of each of the districts.

“As to where that seat or seats are to be taken from, I shall make some general suggestions. I feel that the urban representation is more than what is due to urban areas. It is stated that the town population is ordinarily a little more educated, more enlightened and it should have a little more representation than what is its share. On that principle one or two seats more than what is due on the population basis can be given to the urban population. The urban population is at present over-represented. You take the Muhammadan seats; they are supposed to be representatives of rural areas. But if you take the Muhammadan voters into account, you will find that a very large majority of them are living in municipal areas and in big towns. In Malabar it may not be so; but in the case of other districts, it is so. Though you call them rural seats, really they are urban seats. When there is conflict of interest, they will surely vote in favour of urban interests as against rural interests. You can therefore reduce the representation for the urban population. In districts where you have given representation for special interests, there you can reduce the number of general seats. One seat can easily be taken from the urban seats now allotted. I do not want to suggest any particular district from which a seat should be taken; of course I can do so, but I do not want to as it can be done on some principle. Take Madras for instance; Madras is over-represented, particularly, if you take into account its fair chance of securing, labour, commerce seats, etc. Because it is a metropolitan city, Madras is given more representation. Is that a ground on which inordinate representation should be given to Madras? Representation can be worked out on a fair basis. It is not fair that towns should be over-represented. Again ladies ought to get only one urban seat; they are now getting 5 urban seats, one in Malabar, one in Tinnevely and Palamcottah and one in East Coast and two in Madras. You may say they are special seats, but they represent towns as well.

“I now come to the general consideration of the report; I think a lot of changes have to be carried out in spite of immense care bestowed on it. Some vital considerations have not been taken into account by the Delimitation Committee. If it is the opinion of the Government and the Committee that there ought to be very small areas so as to make them manageable, that principle should be applied in all cases. If that principle is applied, Ceded districts ought to have more representation. If the Government and Committee cannot apply that principle throughout the whole Presidency, why should they stick up to single-member constituencies? Whatever advantage there may be for a few individuals to have small single-member constituencies, I think it is not desirable to have them. When party system is developed on

31st October 1935]

[Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

the right lines, when voters become more enlightened, I think it is much more desirable that we should have as large a constituency as possible from many points of view. I think the time is come to have a sound party system; it has already come; I do not agree with my hon. Friend Dr. Subbarayan and two others who have said that organized parties have not come into existence in this country. I am absolutely certain that, when we go before the country during the next general elections, there will be only two parties and no more. There would be the Congress Party on the one side and the Justice Party on the other. They are practically the only two organized parties, I think. It is considered by the Government themselves that the Congress Party is well organized; and I am sure steps are being taken by the leaders of the Justice Party to well organize their party too. So, during the next elections, it will only be a question of parties, and not of persons. And if constituencies consist of large areas, there will be people throughout those areas, belonging to both these parties who will be able to come into close contact with the whole electorate and influence them. I do not therefore see any reason why the area should be small. Sir, I have myself sufficient experience of these elections, and I am of opinion that it is always better to have a large area, because some of the evil influences which we see existing in small areas will not exist in bigger areas. For instance, if the voters in an area are too many, it will not be possible so easily to corrupt them as in a small area, such as a local board. If the area is small and consequently if the number of voters is small, there is always the possibility of their being influenced by means other than proper and fair. On this ground alone, I won't mind if even a whole district is formed into one constituency; if that is not possible, at least two or three divisions should be grouped together into one constituency and it should be made not a single-member or double-member constituency but a multi-member constituency.

4-45
p.m.

"Again, Sir, even amongst the Hindus and among the non-Brahmans, there are many small influential sub-communities who, if the area is small, would always try to use their communal and sub-caste influences to get a man of their own community or sub-caste elected, as against a better and more highly qualified candidate. If however the area is large, the opportunities for such communities to monopolize the seats will not be great; at any rate, the other communities would try to join together as against that particular community which tries to monopolize the seat, and break the monopoly as early as possible. It is therefore much better in the interests of the country, in the interests of the better organization of parties and in the interests of the voters themselves that we should have bigger areas constituting multi-member constituencies.

"Coming now to the system of voting, Sir, I cannot claim to have studied the systems now prevailing in the various countries; but I have some knowledge of that which is in vogue in our own Presidency. This

[Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

[31st October 1935]

system, in my opinion, has worked very satisfactorily, and I do not see any reason why it should not continue. In a single-vote system each voter will have only one vote. If you take a double-member constituency where you have a reserved seat for the depressed classes, what will happen? It is most likely that the depressed classes will vote for their candidates alone; and the other communities may join together and vote against the depressed class nominee. Apart from that, if two candidates are working jointly, there will be at the last moment, an anxiety to get in even at the cost of the other candidate and thus unduly influence voters; and when they are both opposed by two other candidates on party lines, it will be a very difficult process to calculate as to how many votes should be polled in favour of the depressed class candidate and how many in favour of the other, so that both may succeed. Each party would like to be sure of one man at least getting in, rather than trying to succeed in respect of both and lose both. By way of illustration, suppose the Justice Party puts in two candidates and the Congress Party two. Either party may be willing to make sure at least of one candidate being returned. In such cases, each party would try to influence the voters to concentrate on one candidate of their party. My fear is that such calculations will come into play at the last moment, at the cost probably of a more desirable candidate. These things can be easily avoided by having a distributive system of voting. The Government seem to consider that at the time of polling, there will be great loss of time if we adopt the distributive voting. In my opinion, there need be no such difficulty. When a voter goes into the polling booth, he is well aware as to whom he should vote for; and therefore there cannot be much waste of time in the booth itself on the part of the voter in choosing his candidate. As I said, in the case of the single voting, communal influences will play great havoc.

“Further, the object of the Poona Pact will be completely lost if we adopt this single-vote system. Mahatma Gandhi and the other leaders of the caste Hindu communities agreed to an increase in the number of depressed class seats, with a view to bring about a saner influence among the communities, so that the caste Hindu had to go to the depressed classes for votes as much as the depressed classes candidate goes to the caste Hindus for their votes. Unless the Adi-Dravida voter has two votes, one of which he can give to his own community man and the other to the caste Hindu man, there can be no direct contact between the depressed class Hindu and the other Hindus. Therefore I say that if the spirit of the Poona Pact is to be carried out, we must have the distributive system of voting. Besides, there is no need for primary election. Mahatma Gandhi, as we all know, was prepared to die to bring about this saner influence, and it is up to us to continue the spirit underlying the Poona Pact.

“Once more, Sir, I appeal to the authorities to see that the rural areas are given their proper share of representation in the Councils. I have been always fighting in this Council for rural interests. The

31st October 1935]

[Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

number of representatives coming from the rural areas ought to be in proportion to the population in those areas, and this important point has been lost sight of by the committee. The representation given to Muhammadans is more urban than rural, and I hope that the authorities will see to it that the number of seats now assigned to towns is reduced and more seats are given to rural areas, especially for the rural areas of the Ceded districts.

“ Finally, Sir, with regard to . . . ”

* The Hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT:—“ May I know how long the hon. Member is likely to take to finish his speech? ”

* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—“ I shall take about five or ten minutes, to-morrow, Sir.”

The House then adjourned to meet again at 11 a.m. the next day.

VII.—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

^a 1. *Return of officers under the Government of Madras who held temporary, acting, or probationary appointments on the 1st April of each of the years 1924 to 1935.*

^a 2. *Return of officers under the Government of Madras who held permanent appointments on the 1st April of each of the years 1924 to 1935.*

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS